REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 are pending in the application; the claims have been amended. Reexamination and reconsideration are hereby requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-8 were rejected as anticipated by Färjh. The Examiner pointed to Färjh column 7, various lines.

With regard to claim 1, applicant replies that Färjh moves one or two of the two on_time sampling points to provide a minimum separation for the two trackers; see Figs.5a-5d and column 7, lines 12-16. In contrast, claim 1 requires the early-late spacing (e.g., δ in the equations) for a single tracker to be changed; see application page 9.

With regard to claims 2 and 5, applicant again replies that Färjh moves the sampling points after updating (column 7, lines 12-16); whereas, claim 2, step (c) and claim 5, step (c) each requires ignoring the updating of the weaker path sampling points under certain conditions. Updating and then moving does not suggest ignoring an update.

With regard to claim 8, applicant again replies that Färjh moves the sampling points after updating (column 7, lines 12-16); whereas, claim 8, step (d) requires a type of interference cancellation.

The Examiner objected to the specification due to the ambiguous status of Fig.3.

Applicant replies that application page 7 has a preferred embodiment as including a method of control of the apparatus of Figs.2-3. Thus applicant is unsure whether to label Figs.2-3 as prior art or not; the apparatus is known, but not all methods of control of the apparatus are known or obvious.

The appendix contains proposed drawing changes to Figs.4-5 which add the labeling "prior art".

Respectfully submitted,

Carlton H. Hoel
Reg. No. 29,934
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.4365